

**GNSO  
Operations Steering Committee Community (OSC)  
Constituency Operations Work Team  
9 April 2010 at 13:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Operations Steering Committee Community (OSC) Constituency Operations Work Team teleconference 9 April 2010 at 13:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings **at the meeting, but** should not be treated as an authoritative record. **The audio is also available at:**

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-constituency-ops-20100409.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#apr>

**Participants present:**

**Olga Cavalli – NCA – Work Team Chair**

**Claudio Digangi – IPC**

**Chuck Gomes – Registries Stakeholder Group**

**Michael Young - Registries Stakeholder Group**

**Tony Harris - ISPCP**

**ICANN Staff**

**Julie Hedlund**

**Glen de Saint G ry**

**Apologies :**

**Victoria McEvedy – IPC**

**Debra Hughes – NCSG**

**Rafik Dammak – NCSG**

**SS Kshatriya – Individual**

**Zahid Jamil – CBUC**

**Krista Papac – Registrar Stakeholder Group**

Coordinator: Please go ahead.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you so much. Good morning, good evening, everyone. Julie, could you be so kind to help me do a roll call?

Julie Hedlund: Certainly. On the call I'm going -- good morning, good afternoon, everyone. On the call we have Olga Cavalli, Claudio DiGangi, and

Chuck Gomes. From staff we have Glen de Saint Gery and Julie Hedlund.

Olga Cavalli: All right, Chuck. Good morning.

Chuck Gomes: Good morning.

Olga Cavalli: Okay and before we were starting the call and thank you for joining -- we were talking with Julie and with Glen about our deadline to submitting our outcome to the OSC. And Chuck please correct me if I'm wrong and Julie remind me about this - the document should be first submitted to the OSC and then to the GNSO. Is that correct?

Chuck Gomes: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. So we have more time, because I was confused and I thought it should go first to the GNSO and then to the OSC. And that would give us less time. So in light of the deadline in the 1 of June which is challenging for us - I have been checking all the comments in the list which by the way are very interesting and very diverse. And I tried to summarize them. I couldn't.

I tried to make a - the big table and put them all together, but then I realized it didn't make any sense, because they were different. And (unintelligible) is in different things in the document.

So I don't know what you think and I would like to hear from you other ideas, but I think we have to go through the document still and try and define a common text that fits the ideas of the working team. And if

someone doesn't agree then they can submit a minority report. There is no other way to work the document.

And I also agree with Chuck that doing it in the Wiki is quite complicated. I myself have some difficulties in reading the document with all the strike-throughs and the signs in the text. And it's - I found difficult to realize which were the final wording and the final reduction of it.

So I was thinking about perhaps we could work - I think Chuck suggested this. We could work on a Word document with a cleaner version, without the strike throughs and with (console) of changes. Do you think this is a feasible idea or that would help us better work in the document?

Chuck Gomes: Olga, you don't have to - I don't think if you're working on a Word document you can - you don't have to eliminate the strike throughs and things like that. It's pretty clear in a Word document when you're using...

Olga Cavalli: You're right.

Chuck Gomes: It's in the Wiki where it's very confusing.

Olga Cavalli: The Wiki is confusing and we are not using the Wiki as perhaps we could is that we all edited the document. And we are not doing this which is okay. I mean I'm not saying it's wrong. But that's the (facility) and where the Wiki works well when many people edit in the same document, but that wouldn't make sense for us, because we are so many and we want to see the different views.

So I would propose after this call perhaps, Julie, you could help us prepare a new Word document and we can work it using changes control and that appears in the right side with small boxes with comments. You think that would help?

Julie Hedlund: Olga, this is Julie. I'm happy to do that. It'll take a little bit of time, because I'm - I'll now have to take the Wiki - it would have been better if we started with a Word documents first. But to take the Wiki and then...

Olga Cavalli: I don't know, I mean I'm trying to find...

Julie Hedlund: Because, you know, (unintelligible) Wiki and the I have to take - maybe I can take the original document. Maybe that's what I'll do and make the changes that we have on the Wiki. I'll just do it. I'll just print out the Wiki and do it. Because I can't really copy and paste out of the Wiki, because none of that will show up as, you know, properly in Word.

You really have to start with the original Word document. And then make the changes that we've made on the Wiki into the Word document. So they're shows as, you know, deletions and strike throughs and so on. So I don't think I can do that - absolutely - I just don't think I will be able to complete it today. It probably will not...

Olga Cavalli: No, no, no and I don't want to overload you with work. But also I think that we - at the end we will submit a Word document or a PDF that will be done (unintelligible).

Julie Hedlund: And either way it has to be in a Word document. And fortunately I will say that because we have not begun work on Task 1, sub-Task 3. (Chris Vantony)'s document - that one, you know, we'll just simply use the Word document that she sent around and make changes to that. And that of course will simplify things greatly, as opposed to working in the Wiki at all on that one I would recommend.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. So and also I would like to ask you if you could start working on a final document that has (sub-Task 1) document which is already reviewed. And I haven't heard any comments about (Chris Vantony)'s document. It has been already circulated a while ago.

So perhaps you can add it to the general document as it is now. And if we don't hear anything maybe in one week more we can consider it approved. And still working on this sub-task two document?

Julie Hedlund: Certainly. I can go ahead and make these all one document? And I am then in doing so assuming that the changes we have, you know, in the Wiki on, you know, Task 1 - sub-Task 1 are approved as they stand.

I mean and that's - and so I guess my question would be in combining these into one document (unintelligible). Is it not necessary then to show the final version, Task 1 - sub-Task 1 as strike through and additions and so on, because the work team has agreed to those or is it necessary to leave them in as additions and deletions. I'm just not sure.

Olga Cavalli: I think that the edited version with all the changes and strike throughs and all that could remain in the Wiki as reference.

Julie Hedlund: Oh, right. But what I'm saying is if I'm combining all three of these sub-tasks into one document, shall I show these additions and deletions in Task 1, sub-Task 1 which we're - which we've completed and approved as, you know, changes, you know, as deletions/additions or simply as text. Text meaning, you know, approved with no change, you know, not (unintelligible) type of thing.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. I see. Any comments?

Chuck Gomes: Yes. This is Chuck. I'd like to make a comment.

I see the advantage of creating the basic structure and the general text for a final document now, but if we start putting in the sections that we're still working on then that means we're going to have to update them in two places. So I would not put anything into the final document until we know that it's all approved and at that stage I'd put in the clean version.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Chuck. I totally agree. In my modest understanding sub-Task 1 was already agreed. We haven't received any other comments and we finished the document I think a month ago.

So I think that could go. If someone disagrees please let me know. And also (Chris Vantony)'s document, we can insist that people send comments but we haven't heard about them in this last - I think she sent it two or three weeks ago.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, but...

Olga Cavalli: And it wasn't really agreed before (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Yes, but until we get confirmation from people that...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...it's ready to go. I would say don't put it in the final document yet, otherwise we're going to be working in two different places and trying to synchronize those and that just complicates Julie's work.

Olga Cavalli: I totally agree. Okay. Any other comments? Claudio?

Claudio DiGangi: Yes, that all makes sense to me. I mean I had sent a comment to the list recently about - and I know we sort of reviewed and approved the first sub-task document, but I had sent something to the list recently. Just, you know, I guess, you know, following that review process and some of our other discussions and the fact that the GNSO working group guidelines document had been posted for public comment and I think we got an opportunity to see how they were presenting their recommendations.

I had sort of taken a step back and looked at the document and our - sort of our overall approach and I had suggested to the list just basically - it was almost comment in regards to just the way we were presenting the recommendations. And I had basically suggested that we amend some of the language to put it in I think a more digestible form and I think a form that's more consistent with the other implementation effort that's under way.

So I don't know what the group, you know, thinks about that and - but that was something that I just put on the table in terms of - and it would

require I guess some changes to the first sub-Task 1 document in terms of just some of the language. And it's not really to change the intent of the language that we've agreed on. It was - it's really just more to present it in a different way. And so that was, you know, that was really the only other item that I guess I would mention.

Chuck Gomes: Claudio, this is Chuck. I hear you saying two things. One of them is format and one of them is language. The format if it's, you know, that I would think would be a non-controversial issue if it's not too cumbersome a task. But the language I would predict would be more of a problem.

Claudio DiGangi: Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Because it - I suspect we then end up having to go back and see, so I have concerns about changing language, because we had a terrible time agreeing on language as it was.

Olga Cavalli: Yes. This is Olga. I somehow agree with Chuck. I think it's a good idea Claudio, that you suggest this, but my concern is that we should finish someday with the document as an outcome and Chuck, please let me know what happens if we don't - if we don't finish out document by - we already - I already told Philip that we may not and I think we won't be able to produce any outcome for sub-task two until the near future, but not June the 1. And I have to confirm this to tell it, but what happens if we don't send the (announcement) for June 1. We have been working on this for one year and a half or more.

Chuck Gomes: Well I don't think it's the end of the world, okay?



Olga Cavalli: No, I know.

Chuck Gomes: I think that it, you know, the counsel can deal with that and the OSC can deal with that. But we shouldn't give up on that yet. It's a ways before June 1. So I think we should cross that bridge when we closer to it.

And in the meantime still try and achieve that goal. If we don't and this group probably would raise controversy. If we don't I would suggest we may want to, you know, send what we have forward - Task 1 - send all of Task 1, so at least that can move forward while we finish task two.

Now I know we seemed to have a great deal of problem with that or some people did. The last time we separated our work, but that's one alternative. But again my suggestion is let's deal with that when we get a little closer and see that we're definitely not going to make it.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Thank you, Chuck.

Man: Can we go?

Olga Cavalli: Yes. Who's this?

Man: It's (Michael) joining. Sorry to be late.

Olga Cavalli: (Michael), (Tony), good morning.

Man: Well actually I was on, but I keep getting dropped off by the operator, because it's an echo on my line. But I'm back now. I hope there's no echo now.

Olga Cavalli: I hear you very well, (Tony). Thank you for joining. Bye, (Michael).  
Thank you for joining.

Man: Bye. I'll be on mute most of the time. I'm in a noisy environment.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. No problem. We were just discussing about if we can comply with the date suggested by the USC for sending our (outcome) document which is June the 1. We were talking about that and how can we work on our document from now on.

Okay, so I suggest that we go to the text and try to work on it. I need some help in finding - we had some wording in part - we are talking about Task 1, sub-task two report. We have worked in several parts of the document, but we still have some - there was some text sent by Mary Wong from the NCUC and please, Julie, help me remember where that text applied to. I think it was some part of Executive (Committees) or (Committees). I can't recall in this moment. Rafik, is not on the call, right?

Julie Hedlund: Olga, it's Julie. So we had asked - Rafik had asked Mary Wong if she had alternative language for Section Two, Sub Section Eight policy where it talks about policy committee meetings should be open for attendance by all group members and an election constituency to the public. But I think there was also quite a bit of discussion on whether or not term limits applied to policy - I'm sorry to policy committees as well. I can pull up the language that Rafik sent quickly if we want to consider it if you'd like.

Olga Cavalli: I think we should start from there, because I think it's one of the first parts of the document that still has to be reviewed. Am I correct or am I missing something before?

Julie Hedlund: Well Olga, this is Julie. So we did have quite a bit of discussion on that Section Eight. We had - but you know, Rafik had agreed that he should check back with Mary. (Unintelligible) find that.

Olga Cavalli: Okay so, Julie, help me again. Where can we start discussing the document now? Because the wording sent by Mary responds to which section?

Julie Hedlund: Eight I believe - eight policy, but I'm just...

Olga Cavalli: Yes, it's policy, yes.

Julie Hedlund: ...pull up that message just very quickly and I'm sorry I didn't have it available, but I wasn't quite sure where you wanted to start. So I just want to make sure I have it here.

Olga Cavalli: Now maybe I'm mistaken, because I have seen comments about (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: Yes...

Julie Hedlund: We have comments in a lot of areas. Go ahead, Chuck. Maybe you can clarify.

Chuck Gomes: Olga, let me make a suggestion.

Olga Cavalli: Sure.

Chuck Gomes: I think for two weeks now we've been grappling with where term limits apply and I think it's time we put a stake in the ground and find out where everybody's at. If I understand it correctly there are basically three positions that have been proposed. One of them is terms limits applied at everything. Any group that's formed, policy committee, whatever that is and most of us don't even have them. And they seem to be really informal, whatever.

The second position is, is that it only applies to counselors and officers, I think that's the second position. Is that right, Claudio?

Claudio DiGangi: Yes. Yes.

Chuck Gomes: Now okay. And then the third position is a compromise that I suggested that is that term limits apply to counselors, to officers and to executive committee members. Now some of those, depending on the structure - individual structure may overlap.

But I that - I think that's okay. The bottom line - that was my compromise position. And so it might be helpful if we just find out where each person is right now. And then I think we need to put a stake in the ground. If we can't come to some sort of a consensus position we can propose the alternative and let the OSC deal with it and then ultimately the counsel.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Chuck. Great suggestion. Which part of the text is this one Julie, because I'm totally lost with the document? Sorry, my apologies.

Chuck Gomes: Actually I think it will probably, Olga, I think that it probably will cover multiple sections of the text, because...

Olga Cavalli: Yes, that's my problem. I'm trying to find (unintelligible)...

Chuck Gomes: The way it's structured right now, we deal with those different things in different places in the document...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...if I'm understanding it correctly. Is that right, Julie.

Julie Hedlund: Yes. Chuck, that's - this is Julie. That's correct. I mean it could fall under executive committees, it can fall under committees, it could fall under, you know, policy, any number of places, election, yes.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Thank you, Julie. So Chuck, made a suggestion about three different views. Any comments to that?

(Tony): This is (Tony). I think Chuck made a good suggestion.

Chuck Gomes: Now one of the things too that we - one of the things that this is illustrating is just that the length and complexity of the structure of this document is really not ideal at all. So if we can agree on principals. For example if we can agree on which one of these three options or any other option we support then we could actually have a section on term limits and specify what our position is and have it occur in multiple places, but that - we can deal with that later.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. So about the three different approaches that Chuck explained, can we know which is the stance of the working team at this moment. Any comments? Any ideas of what we want to, because we want to make recommendations. That's our task.

(Tony): Can I get in the queue, (Tony).

Olga Cavalli: Sure, (Tony). Go ahead. Yes well, I'm trying to remember the three that Chuck said correctly. But I think I would lean to number two. Chuck, would you like to restate it to make sure I understood correctly.

Chuck Gomes: Okay, number one was term limits to apply to any committees or any groups formed...

(Tony): Yes.

Chuck Gomes: ...and people associated.

(Tony): That's a no, no.

Chuck Gomes: Number two was just counsel members and actually I don't even know if we need to deal with counsel members, because that's covered - is that covered in the - already covered in the - with regard to counselors? I think it is, maybe not. Counselors, officers and executive team members, oh no, excuse me, counselors and officers is number two.

And number three was counselors, officers and members of the executive committee.

(Tony): Could I ask for clarification, Chuck? You have two levels of executive committee. You have the executive committee on the stakeholder group and then you have within the constituencies - they may not all be called the same, but at least in our constituency we do have an executive committee. I think they're two different things.

Chuck Gomes: Yes and throughout this document we're making recommendations at least so far, maybe that could change that is apply to constancies and stake holder groups.

(Tony): That would be number two?

Chuck Gomes: That would be - well number two...

(Tony): No.

Chuck Gomes: ...is just officers...

(Tony): Just counselors.

Chuck Gomes: ...of constituencies and stake holder groups and counselors. Okay?

(Tony): But number two...

Chuck Gomes: Number three would be number two plus members of executive committees for constituencies and stakeholder groups.

(Tony): Well I'm sorry. I lost you, but okay I'll stand back. I'll wait.

Chuck Gomes: No, let's make sure it's clear (Tony). I'm sorry I'm not communicating it very well. So the only difference between number two and number three is number three include executive committees. And so far when I've been talking about executive committees and I'm talking about executive committees of stake holder groups and constituencies.

(Tony): Okay, but then number three would look pretty much like number one?

Chuck Gomes: No. No, because what we've been talking about on the list is that number one, would include anybody that's a member of a policy committee, has term limits, anybody that's a member of any other committee or sub group that a constituency of stake holder group would form...

(Tony): Okay.

Chuck Gomes: ...would also have term limits. Number one is extremely broad.

(Tony): Okay, Chuck, just for clarity purposes, since I may not - our opinion might not fit in with any of the three. Perhaps we could have a number four which I would propose would be simply the term limits should apply to counselors and officers within the stakeholder groups and exclude constituency from this. I think the story within constituency borders should be different.

Chuck Gomes: So you think constituencies should only have - should not have term limits at all.?

(Tony): Yes.



Chuck Gomes: Okay. I think that's a fourth option then.

(Tony): Yes, I mean - when I say constituencies, I mean the constituencies from their frontier inwards. Once they step out into the stakeholder group or the counsel they their under the term limit arrangements, okay. Just to make that perfectly clear.

Olga Cavalli: So (Tony), this is Olga. Let me understand your proposal is that constituencies in between then - we are suggesting or recommending that they (unintelligible) have their limits for their counsel - for their members. Is that...

(Tony): Well perhaps I haven't stated that correctly. I'm not saying that everybody should recommend this. It's just my opinion. But I think that term limits should not be specified for constituency, let's say in house arrangements. Okay?

The structure of the constituency inwards does not have term limits. The term limits apply when you're participating in the stakeholder group or you're a counsel member. Okay?

Olga Cavalli: Okay. That's a fourth option. Any other comments, Claudio or (Michael)?

Chuck Gomes: Let's check that with the Board - BGC recommendations, just for a moment, okay?

(Tony): Yes, that would be helpful, Chuck, I could be very wrong.

Chuck Gomes: And I'm - don't have them in front of me right now, but maybe others can help. The BGC recommendation was specifically that constituencies have term limits on what?

(Tony): I think it was officers.

Chuck Gomes: Officers and that applied to constituencies. In fact, they specifically said constituencies in that case. So we might - (Tony), with part of your recommendation we might be actually going against what the BGC recommended.

(Tony): Well in that case it's okay - I'll back down from that if that's what the BGC recommends. Okay, so be it.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, no, so - and I just want to bring that up, so we don't get in a situation where we go down this path and we come back and somebody finds its and it goes against our BGC recommendation. So...

(Tony): I'm okay with that.

Chuck Gomes: But still, (Tony), I think you're saying something beyond just officers. Anything beyond officers, you're saying there should - within a constituencies and contrast to a stakeholder group. There would not bet term limits is what you're suggesting?

(Tony) Well, it - I mean we debated this to death I think already about the, you know, sometimes you don't have all the people you want to keep renewing these positions. But I mean that's okay if that's what the BGC says. We'll go along with that.

Chuck Gomes: Well sorry to be talking so much, but let me throw out a way to deal with that, that I've been thinking about the last couple days. Okay, so let's say we went with either Option 2 or Option 3 which is basically - I think Claudio's version or (Mike) compromised that included the executive committees. What if we had an exception clause that had to be approved by the constituency membership according to their procedures?

So that when there is a case and I understand that there will cases when people just won't volunteer and you're in a situation. We've all dealt with that and we'll deal with it again even as membership expands. Why don't we just put in an exception clause? The requirement is term limits for whichever groups we decide with an exception clause that has anything that varies from that needs to be approved by the membership.

(Michael): I thought we had that in there...

(Tony): That's okay.

(Michael): I'm sorry -- (Michael) -- can I get in queue?

Olga Cavalli: Sure. Are you finished, Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: Yes, sorry I was taking so long.

Man: Can I get in the queue?

Olga Cavalli: No, that's okay. Yes, so I have (Michael) and then Claudio and (Tony) want to be in the queue also?

Man: Yes.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, (Michael), go ahead please.

(Michael): So you know, as far as I understand the last language that I did actually allows for an exception and really the question on the table is how far what - it includes, you have the term limits plus the exceptions we've already built into the language.

How far does that apply? And so Chuck, I think the exception mechanism is already stated in their from our previous edit. I was really - I'm leaning more and more toward two, just the cleanliness of it and because I think and by that I mean it's in compliance with the (G) recommendation. I was thinking your compromise on three until you pointed out the direction of the BGC again. And now I think we have to go with two based on that.

Chuck Gomes: Well you have to be careful. Let me qualify, (Michael). My - The BGC recommendation - keep in mind that there was no such thing as a stakeholder group when the BGC made their recommendations.

(Michael): Right, but I'm thinking more about the policy committees and so forth that the groups may form.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, but that's in Option 1, not in Option 3.

(Michael): Right. So I'm a little torn on that, because I think the spirit of it is the control position. So can someone effectively assert control over a stakeholder group or a constituency for an extended period of time and

the idea of the term limit is to make sure that there's not a (unintelligible) extended control under an influential body. But that representation rotates reasonably. And we have to balance that with willingness to participate and quality of participation.

Well you know, really the whole thing around, you know, sub groups formed within our policy committees, associated really wasn't referred to. And stakeholders groups we really know are an equivalency to constituency and it's really nomenclature more so than something, you know, fundamentally new. So I'm not worried about that being introduced, Chuck, but I don't know whether or not we should be stepping into the question of term limits on people participating in policy committees.

Chuck Gomes: I don't think we should, (Michael). You're still not I don't think getting Option 2. The only thing different between Option 2 and Option 3 is it includes executive committees which is a new concept in all of the stakeholder group charters. And some constituencies have those things as well. And...

(Michael): Well then I'm okay with three if that's the case and that's the limitation I'm okay with three.

Chuck Gomes: Okay. That's what I wasn't following. Okay, now executive committees in some cases are just going to be counselors and officers, but in the case of the registries for example that is not the case.

We have a Vice Chair that's not - that may not be a counselor or is not a counselor right now and is, you know, I guess that would be considered an officer, so maybe I'm wrong in that regard. So it has -

our executive committee includes a treasurer, that's also an officer. So maybe I'm wrong. Maybe - may - let me ask that question.

And I'm sorry to belabor this, but let's get it straight once and for all. Do any executive committees that anybody is aware of on this call include any people other than officers or counselors?

Claudio DiGangi: Chuck, this is Claudio. It's possible the NCUC might. I know they recently redid...

Chuck Gomes: Okay.

Claudio DiGangi:...their charter and stuff. So I'm not sure, but I think it's a possibility.

Chuck Gomes: But regardless it seems to me if we include executive committees it's not very different from Option 2. It might include one or two people in certain cases. So it doesn't seem like a hard compromise.

Olga Cavalli: Are you finished, Chuck?

Chuck Gomes: I hope so.

Olga Cavalli: (Michael), it's Claudio. You were in the queue after (Michael) and then it's (Tony).

(Michael): Yes, so, well you know, because I was going to comment on the executive committee term limit and what I was going to say was that it - well so there isn't exactly a committee on the stakeholder group level and there isn't on - I mean there's no requirement that, that exists on the constituency level.

Chuck Gomes: Right.

(Michael): And so in a weird way, you know, because I think if we - so there might be and there's also differences (between) and the non-contracted - in the contracted party house there's no constituencies. And so I guess it's possible that we can make that rule. Say there's a term limit for executive committees. In the contracted party house it would apply there, but it's possible (unintelligible) it would not apply on the constituency level if the constituency did not have a stakeholder group.

I mean I'm sorry, the constituency did not have an executive committee. And so it just seem incongruent a little bit to me. I was going to recommend like maybe we could just have a term limit for the executive committee and the stakeholder group level.

And not have it at the constituency level since it's not really part of the constituency structure. But I just wasn't sure if that would be incongruent, because again I don't know if that's really equal, because it might put a greater burden on the contracted side since, you know, they operator through the stakeholder group structure.

So that's where I kind of got stuck a little bit with the term limits on the executive committees. It's just because it's not an equal - it's not an equal structure throughout all these different groups.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Claudio, (Tony).

Claudio DiGangi: Yes. I'm thinking Olga. I'll keep silent for a while.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, no problem.

Julie Hedlund: Olga. This is Julie. I apologize. I was disconnected from the call and nothing happened with my phone so I'm not sure why that was, but I apologize I missed a couple of minutes.

Olga Cavalli: Don't worry. We are talking about possible text, about term limits.

Chuck Gomes: And I think we're really close Olga, to some of this.

Olga Cavalli: I was going to propose if we can (drop) something in this call. Chuck, would you repeat what you suggested and see if agree in the text.

Chuck Gomes: Well before I do that let's make sure. So what I heard Claudio just say, is, is that have term limits for counselors and officers and for executive committees at the stakeholder group level, but not necessarily at the constituency level, because they may not apply there. Is that correct, Claudio

Claudio DiGangi: Yes. That's it. That's exactly right.

Olga Cavalli: Yes.

(Tony): And that's my position too. (Tony) here.

Chuck Gomes: And do any constituencies have executive committees?

(Tony): The ISPs do.

Chuck Gomes: Okay.



Olga Cavalli: (Michael), are you okay with that position, with that - with this idea?

(Michael): I think so.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. So we should find a text that includes this idea of term limits for counselors, officers, for executive committees, stakeholder groups and...

Man: Level.

Olga Cavalli: ...at the constituency level, okay?

Man: No, no, at stakeholder group level. It's - let's try that.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, level, okay.

Chuck Gomes: Now I predict that we're going to get objection from (Victoria) on that. In fact, I think we can count on that. Now the - anybody disagree with that?

Man: No.

Olga Cavalli: No.

Man: So I would bet on that, yes.

Chuck Gomes: So we need to at that point I think, you know, survey - poll the group and see where it comes out and put a minority position or put, you know, something like that rather than to continue to debate this issues.

Olga Cavalli: All right.

(Tony): Yes, can I speak? I'll go when you're finished.

Olga Cavalli: Sure. Go ahead, (Tony).

(Tony): Yeah, what I was just trying to convey in the email, but of course I got immediately rejected by a certain party was that in the case of the ISP constituency the executive committee is not a policy body. It's just a coordination group which keeps the constituency functioning. It does not form policy or do anything like that.

Chuck Gomes: That's an important point to make clear, (Tony), that's good.

(Tony): Yes, it's just an operational body to make sure that, you know, things move forward, that we respond to everything we have to respond. And that the members are kept on board on exactly everything that's happening and have a chance to provide input. But the policy work is conducted within the - at the stakeholder group level and within the counsel.

Chuck Gomes: Now if there is and I'm trying to play devil's advocate there. But if there is an executive committee and some constituency that actually is involved in policy decision, does that change the position?

(Tony): Well yes and actually what we could then do is think of some other - some way to differentiate both functions, the operational from the policy.

Chuck Gomes: Yes, that's a good suggestion.

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

(Tony): Let's say the functional more than the operational. The functional from the (posie).

Olga Cavalli: Could we try to address something? We have 15 minutes.

Chuck Gomes: Well Julie, do you have a good grasp of the - of what we're talking about that you could maybe develop something offline.

Julie Hedlund: This is Julie. I can certainly try. I think I've got it. I mean we do have language with respect to term limits, as an example that Claudio proposed. It's in Section Four, but just if we are talking about term limits, just the term limit language and then I can get to the point about to where it applies - to which of the pieces it applies. Option 3 I guess.

We're talking about - Claudio had said, no person shall serve in the same group leadership position for more than four consecutive years. The grandfather clause shall cover those volunteers currently serving in leadership positions. Any exception to this policy would required approval by the membership. Does that language still stand, as far as my using that for the term limit section?

Chuck Gomes: Yes and then it applies. I said...

Julie Hedlund: And then you would say this, you know, and then there would be - like okay that could be A and then B could be term limit supply to - in

stakeholder groups to counselors, officers and executive committee officers. Is that what we're...

Chuck Gomes: It's executive committee members.

Julie Hedlund: Members, okay. And in constituencies - well constituency stakeholder groups, I just I'm not sure we want to say that.

Chuck Gomes: Okay well, you're really close. All you need - for constituencies it applies to counselors and officers.

Olga Cavalli: Officers.

Julie Hedlund: Counselors and officers, but we were talking about - and then what do we want to say. Per (Tony), except for those constituencies...

Chuck Gomes: And okay, let me...

Julie Hedlund: ...but have executive committees that...

Chuck Gomes: Are involved in policy decisions - policy work - policy decisions, I think is what it needs to be. Is that right, (Tony)?

(Tony): Exactly, yes.

Julie Hedlund: Now keeping in mind that this will be the one section that mixes groups. I mean if we say, I guess we'll have to say, okay there's the term limit piece. Everyplace else in the document we've changed everything to groups, because stakeholder groups and constituencies here we're parsing them out and saying there's the terms limits and

they apply and then we're talking about stakeholder groups and constituencies. I'm not saying that that's necessarily wrong. But I'm just saying that, that will be an exception to the rule and the document as far as the terminology.

(Tony): Well perhaps, Julie, we could put in some sort of sentence that says, committees and sub-structures or I don't know what the term might be there that are organized within constituencies for functional purposes would not be subject to term limits for functional non-policy purposes or non-policy making purposes.

Chuck Gomes: Well, but we're actually not including some policy, like a policy committee for example. What we're proposing now, (Tony), would not include policy committees either. That's only if the executive team level where we're excluding it if it's a non-policy function.

(Tony): Okay. I'm happy with that, yes.

Julie Hedlund: I think (unintelligible). I'll send language around, I imagine, you know, it'll meet this week. It'll be a new section, term limit and then I'm guessing if we do that and please correct me if I'm wrong, then we will take out the term limit language where it appears elsewhere, because we have it in a couple of different places.

(Tony): I would support that.

Chuck Gomes: Have a section on term limits that covers this and then the term limits aren't needed in all the individual areas. Does that work?

Julie Hedlund: Yes. That's my question. I'm guessing that we probably want to then make that probably number one in part two, because then, you know, because immediately there after we go into executive committees and we start talking about term limits. So we make part two, one being term limits and we talk about that. And then the next item would be two executive committees and then we just talk about what executive committees do, but we don't have to talk about (turmulence) or...

Chuck Gomes: Yes, that's good. Now do we really need that grandfather clause?

Man: No.

Chuck Gomes: I know that there's been objections to that.

Claudio DiGangi: I don't think we do, Chuck. This is Claudio. I had suggested that. I mean I think honestly I suggested it when I was sort of caught in the almost defensive reactionary position to some of the...

Chuck Gomes: Understand.

Man: Yes. I agree.

Claudio DiGangi: Can I make another comment, Olga.

Olga Cavalli: Sure. Go ahead, Claudio.

Claudio DiGangi: Just in terms of parsing out like the role that the executive committee has in terms of, you know, policy functions or the other functions. I think it might be a little difficult to do that, you know, it might be just

cleaner I think to just have it apply to the executive committee at the stakeholder group level and just sort of leave it at that.

My other comment was going to be just sort of a process question I had in terms of - because, you know, it seems like we are getting pretty detailed with the recommendations. And so I was wondering, you know, when the OSC comes to review this and just how we're presenting this material to them, you know, I just wasn't sure what the process was going to look like at that point if we're sort of presenting this as a package.

But I guess it's always possible that the OSC might look at the recommendations and except some and not accept others. And that sort of related to my other question which was I noticed the working group. The working group guidelines team had put their document out for public comment. And I was wondering if we thought, you know, there'd be value in doing that with this - with these two documents or (writing them) down for that matter.

I think it depends Claudio, on how much work that's going to take to do, you know, assuming that the basic substance stays the same. If it's going to take a lot of time we probably don't have a lot of time. If it can be done fairly simply and if somebody wants to volunteer to try to do that I think that, that might work. But again we're on a time crunch, because our particular working team is taking longer than any others I think.

Claudio DiGangi: And what about at the OSC level, Chuck? Do you have sense of like how the OSC might consider these recommendations?

Chuck Gomes: Well I think first of all the OSC from a general point of view is going to be bothered by the length of this document and possibly by the detail as well, but maybe what we can do is once we get through the substance which we're trying to do, you know, quickly here in the next few meetings. Maybe if we can step back and say, okay we've got the substance. How could we present this in a much more concise and usable fashion?

I think that whether that be like the working group model or something else, I don't know that, that's so important. But I think right now it's not - we may find that we can present the whole package much more efficiently than we're doing the way it's structured right now. But that'll be easier to do once we finish the substance.

Claudio DiGangi: Yes. I agree with that.

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Chuck. And you write something I have been thinking from the last week and yesterday night I read all this exchange of comments in the list. Do we know which other substance issues that we want to revise in the working team? Because if we focus on them, like for example term limits and other things then we can go to the document and try to (adversely) find a long document and I personally find content repeated from different perspectives in different part so the documents which for me is confusing.

Chuck Gomes: Yes and that's what I'm talking about, Olga, is...

Olga Cavalli: Exactly.



Chuck Gomes: ...that we can - once we - let's finish going through it. Let's, you know, fix the things we need and then let's go back and take a holistic view and say how can we organize this more precisely and efficiently.

Olga Cavalli: Exactly. I agree. But my point is in this last minute - could we perhaps exchange some ideas about which are the main issues that we still have to decide about. Is it term limits? We already have a text that we will show it to the rest of the working team. Are other issues that are (wearing) out like elections or some other things...

(Tony): Yes.

Olga Cavalli: ...that have been exchanged.

(Tony): I have one.

Olga Cavalli: (Tony), go ahead.

(Tony): Yes, we had a discussion some time back - it's called (Anex B), the one about relations with ICANN staff.

Olga Cavalli: I think we (deleted) it, huh?

(Tony): It's being deleted? Who's deleted...

Olga Cavalli: Let me check. Let me check.

Julie Hedlund: Actually Olga - this is Julie. No we deleted (Anex A).

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Okay.

Julie Hedlund: There had been suggestions as (Tony) notes in the sub team level to delete (Anex B), but (Anex B) formed part of the remainder of the document that work team members were asked to review since the last meeting.

Olga Cavalli: (Anex B) is the most (unintelligible) relation with ICANN staff working group. Is that what you're talking about, (Tony)?

(Tony): Yes. The one where, you know, they tell us we have to put on a nicely pressed suit and a tie when we address an ICANN staff member and be sure to be very polite and everything. And it seemed like a little bit like school boy literature to me. But I do think we had a discussion at the Seoul meeting - at the face-to-face meeting and everybody at the table thought it was a good idea to forget it.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. So your suggestion is that we take it off - out.

(Tony): Well a lot of people said, let's take it out...

Olga Cavalli: Okay.

(Tony): ...at Seoul. I don't know if they still think the same, but...

Olga Cavalli: See I don't remember that.

(Tony): that was an overall consensus, 100%.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. I think I agreed with that. I really can not recall. I should take the minutes of that meeting. In this moment I can't remember. But Julie,

could we check that. And if we agreed in that we should strike it through.

Julie Hedlund: Olga, this is Julie. Yes, during that discussion - (Tony)'s correct - those members present in Seoul agreed to delete (Anex B). That was of course prior to this, you know, these meetings where we have been discussing, you know, Task 1, sub-task two in great detail. But I think this would be the point again to make that recommendation if those on the call here agree.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, so let's in the next Word document include it and strike it through and see if we comply with what we already agree.

Any other big issue that we have to think about the document right now?

Julie Hedlund: Olga, this is Julie. I did pull up the email that Rafik sent that had the language from Mary Wong on Item 8 Policy. She had quite a bit of text there. I don't know if we want - we - we're at the end of the hour here, but I wasn't sure if there was a consensus as to whether or not the team members wanted to include that (unintelligible).

Chuck Gomes: A quick question in that regard. Is it still relevant considering what we just decided with regard to term limit?

Julie Hedlund: Well it doesn't have to do with term limits though. It's open - it's the attendance (app). And she says, it's really quite lengthily. So I don't know if...

Man: Maybe we should take the next week and look at it again.

Julie Hedlund: Maybe I'll send it around.

Man: And comment. Could you highlight it perhaps in an email, so we could all comment - input on it?

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomez: Okay. And I have to jump off, because - I will talk to you later. Okay?

Olga Cavalli: Thank you, Chuck.

Man: Olga, before we finish the call I have a proposal to make.

Olga Cavalli: Yes, sure. Go ahead.

Man: Yes, I'm thinking - well if Chuck's at home what time is it six in the morning or something?

Olga Cavalli: I think Chuck left.

Man: Okay I'm thinking about, we never have Krista on the calls, but I think she lives in Seattle. And it's probably when we have our call it's five in the morning or something. Is there any reason why we could not have this call a little later during the day, because I mean even for somebody in Europe it's still early if we have it two hours later or something?

Julie Hedlund: Olga, could I address that question?

Olga Cavalli: Sure. Just one comment from side, I have no problem either of the two earlier or later. For me it's okay. Julie, go ahead.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, (Tony), Krista actually had indicated that this time - this particular time works for her.

Olga Cavalli: Exactly.

Julie Hedlund: It was switched at an earlier time at eight o'clock in the morning which is five o'clock for her that, that was difficult. She had - in fact, she was on the last call that we had at this time. So I don't know if she has a particular conflict (unintelligible).

(Tony): Well I'm not sure, but I know that she's not often able to participate. That may not be the reason and I think it's probably not fair to Chuck also, because I think he lives on the West Coast.

Julie Hedlund: Right, but he also has conflicts at other times during the day.

(Tony): Okay.

Julie Hedlund: The point I want to make is that while it might seem that we have options for other times in the day on Fridays we do have now I think close to 20 other policy calls. Glen, can probably tell you how many we have. It makes it extremely difficult for staff to be able to - and the secretariat to be able to cover these calls if we change the time now, because we basically coordinated this time to fit within all of our other calls. So I'm not sure that we could easily change the time at this point.

(Tony): Okay. I will draw out my proposal.

Julie Hedlund: I will try to suggest if we can, you know, if at very least I'd like to try to keep it on the same day, because making a day change would be difficult. I could ask the work team members if they had, you know, and Krista in particular if she had a time that might work for her later in the day on Friday. And Chuck I know has a lot of calls too, so he could say - I know he has a standing call at this time, you know, that's why he was leaving. And I normally have a standing call at this time. So I wouldn't be able to do it one hour later. I might...

(Tony): Julie, please, I withdraw my proposal. I realize it's going to complicate things.

Julie Hedlund: I'm sorry to go on and on. It's a lot more complicated.

(Tony): I was just trying - hoping, you know we could probably have, you know, (unintelligible), but...

Julie Hedlund: I agree with you. I totally agree with you if there weren't some other factors we had to deal with.

(Tony): Okay.

Julie Hedlund: I'm sorry about that.

Olga Cavalli: Okay, thank you. If we could wrap up, Julie, could you please help us. It doesn't have to be today. Could be during the week or Monday, preparing a Word document with this sub-Task 2 content, so we can - I think that this could be useful if we can add some language in the document, so we can start finishing the part that we still have to

review, if you could add Mary's language in the A, B or C and this language about term limits as we already agreed in the document that would be great.

Claudio DiGangi: Okay. We'll see if we can come up with something. It'll - I'm sure it will provoke a big argument, but I'll try and give it a shot.

Julie Hedlund: Yes, I will suggest - I will send today the action items and I will also send today the suggested language for a new term limit section and ask the work team members to respond. And I'll also send Mary Wong's suggestion for (eight) policy.

And I will - not today, but as one of my action items probably on Monday, I will produce a Word text of Task 1, sub-task two for us to now begin to finish our review. And also we'll send around again the document Krista sent, task three and we can maybe just get a confirmation from team members that they have no changes to that document.

Man: Okay.

Olga Cavalli: Okay great. And so we revise the document and we still - we talk again next Friday.

Julie Hedlund: Right, next Friday. And I will ask work team members if they have suggestions for other times. If there is another time that people coalesce around I can coordinate with Glen to see if there's an opening there.

Olga Cavalli: Okay. Thank you so much, Julie, for your help. Thank you everyone for joining and have a nice weekend.

Man: Okay.

Man: Thank you. You too.

Man: You too. Bye-bye.

Julie Hedlund: Appreciate it. Bye-bye.

END